



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,772	07/21/2003	Marc Rohrschneider	740116-490	4231

25570 7590 04/18/2006

ROBERTS, MLOTKOWSKI & HOBBS
P. O. BOX 10064
MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064

EXAMINER

KIM, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/622,772	Applicant(s) ROHRSCHEIDER, MARC	
	Examiner Christopher S. Kim	Art Unit 3752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7,9-11,15,20-22,27,28,38 and 40-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8,12-14,16-19,23-26,29-37,39 and 43-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 30, 2006 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 7, 9-11, 15, 20-22, 27, 28, 38 and 40-42 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 4, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, 16-19, 23-26, 29-37, 39, and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the "cylinder" being part of the "finger operated means", does not reasonably provide

Art Unit: 3752

enablement for the "cylinder" and "finger operated actuator means" being separate elements. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification and the drawings appear to disclose the cylinder 3 being within actuator 9 (for the elected Species C shown in figure 3). If the claims was to be read as requiring separate "cylinder" and "finger operated actuator means," the claims would not read on the elected Species.

A fair reading of paragraphs 22, 23, 28 and 32 of the specification, in conjunction with the figures 1-3, teaches an actuator 9 which has a cylinder 3 (cylindrical volume). It may be fair to assert that the finger operated spray pump comprises an actuator 9 having a cylinder 3, but figures 1-5 do not teach a finger operated spray pump comprising an actuator 9 and cylinder 3. The purpose of paragraph 32 and figure 6 is to teach an embodiment where the actuator 9 and cylinder 3 are separate elements.

In order for claim 1 to be a generic claim, cylinder 3 must be read as a subcomponent of actuator 9 for figures 1-5 and cylinder 3 and actuator 9 must be separate elements for figure 6. This would render the claim indefinite. Based on applicant's argument, would it be fair to say that a prior art that disclosed a one way valve comprising a cylinder, piston, and finger operated actuator means could meet the "cylinder," "piston," "one way valve means," and "finger operated actuator means" of applicant's claim 1?

Art Unit: 3752

5. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, 16-19, 23-26, 29-37, 39 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 35 recite "a cylinder" and "a finger operated actuator means." They appear to be a double inclusion because the cylinder is part of the actuator.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, 16-19, 24, 25, 29-37, 39 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aftergut (1,517,932).

Aftergut discloses, in figure 1, a finger operated spray pump comprising: a liquid reservoir 1; an atomizer 14; a cylinder 5, 6; a piston 3; a passageway means 7, 12; a one way valve means 9; a finger operated actuator 6; a dip tube 8; a second one way valve means 15.

Specifically regarding claims 1, 30, 31, 32, 35, 45 and 46:

Aftergut does not specifically disclose the diameter of the cylinder or the diameter of the nozzle, but Aftergut recognizes, on page 1, lines 94-100, the desirability of adapting the invention to bottles of different sizes.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a piston and cylinder diameter between 0.5 mm and 4.0 mm to accommodate smaller/larger bottles, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3752

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a nozzle diameter between 15 μm and 150 μm to accommodate smaller/larger bottles, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Specifically regarding claims 2, 3 and 36:

Aftergut does not specifically disclose the stroke length.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a stroke length between 2 mm and 30 mm to accommodate smaller/larger bottles, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Specifically regarding claims 4-6, 33, 34 and 37:

It has been held that the recitation that an element is "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

Specifically regarding claims 12, 13, 43 and 44:

Aftergut does not specifically disclose the piston internal diameter.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a stroke length between 0.2 mm and 3.0 mm to accommodate smaller/larger bottles, since it has been held that where the general

Art Unit: 3752

conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Specifically regarding claims 14 and 16-18:

Aftergut does not specifically disclose metal, aluminum and pressure resistant plastic. Metal, aluminum and plastics are well known materials in the art. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have made the device of Aftergut from metal, aluminum or pressure resistant plastic for durability.

All piston/passageway means possess some degree of capillary property.

Specifically regarding claim 29:

Aftergut does not disclose a return spring in the embodiment of figure 1 but does disclose a spring 23 in the embodiment of figure 2.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a return spring in Aftergut's embodiment of figure 1 to automatically return the actuator to the upper position (page 2, lines 16-18).

7. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aftergut (1,517,932) in view of Nozawa et al. (4,530,449).

Aftergut discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the filter. Nozawa discloses a filter 48 between nozzle outlet 44 and second valve 36. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the filter of Nozawa to the device of Aftergut to prevent solids from reaching the nozzle outlet (Nozawa, column 4, lines 50-54).

Art Unit: 3752

8. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aftergut (1,517,932) in view of Corsette (4,050,613).

Aftergut discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the air vent means. Corsette discloses an air vent means 17. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the air vent means of Corsette to the device of Aftergut to permit equalization of pressures (Corsette, column 3, lines 24-25).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-4905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on (571) 272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CK', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Christopher S. Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3752

CK